

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application, initialing the information disclosure statements filed on November 9, 2006 and on June 16, 2006, acknowledging the foreign priority documents, and accepting the drawings.

Disposition of the Claims

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. Further, claims 8-15 are newly added by way of this reply. Of the amended claims, claims 1 and 8 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 8.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1-7 are amended by way of this reply to clarify the invention. Specifically, claim 1 is amended to clarify the invention and correct typographical errors. Claims 2-7 are amended for consistency with claim 1. No new subject matter is added by way of this amendment as support may be found, for example, on p. 4, ll. 16-17, and p. 5, ll. 3, 7-11, 26-27 and in Figure 2 of the originally filed application.

Amendments to the Specification

The specification is amended by way of this reply to correct a typographical error and to correct an error in translation from the original filed French application. Specifically, the

correct translation of “indémontable,” as specified in the PCT application, is “impossible to dismantle.” No new subject matter is added by way of this amendment.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,279,825 (“Yokoyama”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,121,460 (“Parsons”). To the extent that this rejection applies to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention is directed to a secure terminal. The secure terminal has principal means and peripheral means. The principal means include processing means, memories for entering stored data and programs, and a keypad for entering data. The peripheral means include means of printing, means of reading from/writing to a card, means of access to a telecommunications network, and a power supply unit. The principal means are combined in a protected box and the peripheral means are combined into a non protected box. The protected box and the non protected box are connected by means of a single connector. *See, e.g.*, p. 4, ll. 14 – p. 5, ll. 11, and p. 5, ll. 26-27 and in Figure 2 of the Application. The single connector reduces the cost of connecting the protected box to the non protected box and facilitates maintenance of the secure terminal. *See, e.g.*, p. 6, ll. 13-30. Accordingly, independent claim 1 requires, in part, that a protected box having principal means that is connected by mean of a single connector to a non-protected box having peripheral means.

Turning to the rejection, MPEP §2143 states that “[t]he key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious.” The Supreme Court in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct.

1727, 1739, 75 U.S.L.W. 4289 (2007) noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should be made explicit. See, MPEP § 2143. The analysis presented by the Examiner to support the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in the Office Action dated August 21, 2008 indicates that the Examiner found no differences between the cited prior art and the claims besides a lack of the actual combination of the elements in a single prior art reference, i.e., that the Examiner is relying solely on the teachings of the prior art. See, e.g., MPEP § 2143(A). Applicants respectfully assert that Yokoyama and Parsons, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a protected box having principal means that is connected by mean of a single connector to a non-protected box having peripheral means as required by amended claim 1.

Yokoyama is directed to preventing a security case of an electronic transaction terminal from being opened. See, e.g., Yokoyama, Abstract. The security case in Yokoyama is shown as connected with multiple connectors to the electronic transaction terminal. See, e.g., Yokoyama, Figure 1. Yokoyama is silent with respect to connecting the security case with a single connector. Therefore, Yokoyama cannot be used to teach or suggest that a protected box having principal means that is connected by mean of a single connector to a non-protected box having peripheral means as required by amended claim 1.

As shown above, Yokoyama fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Moreover, Parsons fails to teach or suggest that which Yokoyama lacks. Specifically, Parsons merely discloses the functional connections between components. See, e.g., Parsons Figures 2-8. Parsons is silent with respect to the physical connections between the components. Therefore, Parsons is silent with respect to a protected box having principal means that is connected by mean

of a single connector to a non-protected box having peripheral means as required by amended claim 1.

As shown above, Yokoyama and Parsons, whether considered together or separately, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Yokoyama and Parsons. Dependent claims 2-7 are patentable over Yokoyama and Parsons for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims

Claims 8-15 are newly added by way of this reply. No new subject matter is added by way of the new claims as support for the new claims may be found, for example, on pages 4-6 of the Specification and in Figure 2.

Newly added independent claim 8 is directed to a secure terminal. Newly added independent claim 8 requires, in part, that “connection between the protected box and the first non protected box consists of a single connector.” Applicants assert that the phrase “consisting of” should be interpreted in a manner consistent with MPEP §2111.03, which states “[t]he transitional phrase “consisting of” excludes any element, step, or ingredient not specified in the claim.”

As discussed above, Yokoyama and Parsons, whether considered together or separately, fail to teach or suggest that having a single connector to connect a protected box and a non protected box. Therefore, Yokoyama and Parsons, whether considered together or separately, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of newly added independent claim 8. Newly added dependent claims 9-15 are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, favorable consideration of new claims 8-15 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants believe this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 09669/091001).

Dated: November 20, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Jonathan P. Osha/
Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
909 Fannin Street, Suite 3500
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicants